

WE CANNOT AFFORD TO EXPORT JOBS

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest the most recent example in which we condone the taking of jobs from American workers to give to the workers of other nations, and where our own Government even applauds such action.

Specifically I am referring to the recent announcement by the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York City that it proposes to import hydroelectric power from Canada. We all know that our own domestic coal industry has suffered many setbacks in recent years. I for one have repeatedly sought to give it some protection from the flow of residual fuel oil into this Nation. In a number of other ways our coal industry has been penalized—often at the same time we were helping the economies of other nations.

This most recent proposal seems to be going a far way to avoid doing business with American industry. It is reported that these powerlines will stretch some 1,100 miles. It is obvious that we could go a much shorter distance and find adequate coal reserves in the hard-hit Appalachian region, or in the coal fields of Indiana, Illinois, and Kentucky.

If necessary, power-generating facilities could be constructed at the mouth of these mines, and the power carried to the consumers of Consolidated Edison. Or it is also possible to transport coal by pulverizing it and shipping it through coal pipelines.

Fortunately this absurd effort has been strongly protested by the president of the United Mine Workers of America, W. A. Boyle. His protest is timely and well stated.

What makes this effort to export jobs doubly infuriating is that it was praised and complimented by a member of the President's Cabinet, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall. At the same time this administration is talking of a great war on poverty, it overlooks this opportunity to encourage and build employment and prosperity at home and praises the efforts of one power company to take these jobs out of the country.

Mr. Speaker, many of us have the impression that there is a concerted effort on the part of the administration in many fields to not let the right hand know what the left hand is doing. This seems to be one more example where the promise in one field is contradicted by the actions in another.

MIDWEST WILL SUFFER UNDER THE JOHNSON BUDGET

(Mr. LAIRD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised at the alarm expressed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roush] as to the location by the Johnson administration of a new electronics research laboratory to be located in Boston, Mass. I

would suggest to the gentleman from Indiana that within the next few weeks all of us from the Midwest take a close look at the Johnson budget. We find in the Johnson budget there is a request for over \$14 billion in research and development funds. The two largest new laboratories, the Environmental Health Center and the Electronic Research Center will be located on the east coast. Of the funds requested by President Johnson, 82.5 percent will be expended in the coastal States of this country. If this Johnson budget is carried forward, it could very well make the Midwest an economic wasteland. Research and development dollars attract procurement dollars. For each dollar of research expenditure at least \$10 of procurement follow within a period of from 3 to 6 years. This Johnson budget with its emphasis on research laboratories and research contracting in the coastal States can very well have a disastrous effect on the future economic development of the Midwest. I direct your attention to the AEC budget, the defense budget, and the space budget, in particular.

We in the Midwest on both sides of the aisle have a responsibility to analyze this budget closely.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

TRADING BY "ALLIES" WITH CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Americans concerned over recent trade agreements between our "allies" and Cuba were much encouraged by the remarks made last night by Secretary of State Dean Rusk. The Secretary made it very plain that our Government views these deals with Castro as a violation of our friendship and the stated policy of the U.S. Government.

The statement by the Secretary, along with past statements by high-level executive branch officials, clearly state U.S. policy. But we are still faced, not only with the fact of the Cuban trade, but the assumption that our own policy decisions are not being acted upon by our own Government, below the top level. We have been told, over and over, what our policy is. Yet we need to see more results from that policy.

England is selling buses to Castro. Spain is considering selling ships. All of Europe seems interested in giving some form of assistance to Castro, who is working day and night to bring communism to all of Latin America.

Every single time I have asked the State Department for a report on their success to end this trade, we get a reply in general terms suggesting that is a most difficult problem, but that we are hopeful it will meet with success. Certainly it is difficult. It may become more so. But there is not a chance for success unless we make a more determined effort, that has not been demonstrated to date. Particularly, we should make a more determined effort to isolate Cuba through the OAS.

I have made an effort to see what, if anything, is being done to implement the new action by Congress, which will require a halt to all foreign aid to any country which permits its ships or planes to supply Castro, but have received no reply to date.

I have introduced legislation which would close U.S. ports to any nation which permits its ships or planes to trade with Cuba. In the event that the State Department fails to carry out the law in regard to foreign aid in addition to whatever other steps would be indicated, enactment of this legislation would accomplish the same purposes and should be adopted at the earliest possible time.

The Secretary of State has expressed the official displeasure of the U.S. Government to England on the bus deal. Now let us have some action to follow up on the speeches.

A PLEA TO THE PRESIDENT

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Pentagon evidenced an interest in economy last month by discontinuing the activities of 33 of our Nation's defense installations, I accepted the explanation that they were "no longer required by the Armed Forces." In spite of the fact that New York State was hardest hit by this action—seven of its installations are affected—I attributed only the highest and most honest motives to those responsible for the reduction.

I always applaud Government economy where it can be effected without sacrifice to our national security. In the instance of the Defense Department economy program, I was prepared to rely on the judgment of those closest to the situation, feeling they knew best where to save taxpayer dollars, and yet not jeopardize our military readiness.

We all heard suggestions that political expediency was behind the discontinuance decisions. But, I am reasonably certain that most of us in Congress put these statements down as impetuous. Who would believe that our President or our Secretary of Defense would play political favorites in the vital area of national defense?

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a published report that an elected official has stated publicly that New York State was picked to "bear the brunt" of 6,000 displaced Defense Department employees out of a nationwide total of 21,000 because New York does not have a Democrat U.S. Senator. The gentleman went on to tell his partisan audience in Geneva, N.Y., on Saturday, January 11, that because New York has elected two Republican U.S. Senators and a Republican Governor "it takes a superhuman effort to remind the national administration that New York State is still in the Union."

Frankly, I could not believe my eyes when I read the United Press International account of this speech. That any person holding elective office in our Government could impugn so many precious

American ideals to serve his own political ambition defies belief.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that by making these remarks in the House, this serious situation will be brought to the attention of the President. I would urge that the President examine the matter thoroughly and forthwith report to the American people, telling us finally whether political considerations figured in the decision to close certain military installations or whether the statement ascribing this motivation is entirely without substance.

Should the latter alternative be confirmed, I feel the person responsible for the statement is morally obligated to issue a full and public apology for his rash implications. If, in fact, the presence of politics is confirmed by the President, we deserve an Executive explanation—and all the help we can get.

THE LINDSAY-TUPPER BILL FOR HOSPITALIZATION AND NURSING CARE FOR THE AGING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a brief summary and a copy of the bill which I introduced on the subject of hospital care for the aged.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 30 years this country has been at odds over how it should help its elderly citizens protect themselves against the high cost of illness.

As early as 1935, responsible groups were asking the President and Congress to develop a national health insurance plan which would be workable and fair.

Mounting costs of hospital and nursing care, coupled with a steady increase in our elderly population, have made health protection for the aging a major national problem.

The need is plain as the figures and the cases increasingly demonstrate. More and more, we hear of an entire family's savings wiped away by the high cost of hospital or nursing home care. Science and the medical profession have made wonderful advances in making it possible for people to live longer. But who can deny that this has raised additional problems.

For several years there have been bills before the Congress attempting, in various ways, to meet this need. Thus far, the proposals have met a legislative impasse.

Today, I am offering a bill which is not only a constructive alternative to these other views, but which, I believe, can be a means of starting the hospitalization and nursing care plan through Congress. This bill is a refinement—with an important innovation—of earlier hospitalization proposals I have put before the Congress. I am delighted that Congressman STANLEY TUPPER, of Maine,

is joining me in introducing this bill. He has made an enormous contribution toward its development.

At the outset I want to make it absolutely clear that this legislation we are introducing has nothing to do with the practice of medicine or doctors or doctors' fees or the selection of doctors. Nor does it have anything to do with Government involvement in the selection of hospitals. It will not involve the Federal Government in the medical profession.

This legislation is confined to, and only deals with, the question of the mechanical, physical costs of hospitalization, or nursing home care, or nursing care at home. I will explain its provisions, and why I believe it is the alternative that can start this important plan moving, later in these remarks.

This country's population over age 65 is increasing at the rate of 1,000 a day. Next year, it will pass the 18 million mark. By 1980, the census tells us, our aged will number 24,458,000—an increase of more than a third in the next 15 years.

Almost one-half of the over-65 population in the United States must live on incomes of less than \$2,500 a year. Worse, nearly half of the aging who live alone have incomes of less than \$1,000 a year. One-half have liquid assets of less than \$1,000. About 40 percent have less than \$5,000 total assets, including homes.

Added to the problem of scarce funds is the fact that one-half of our over-65 citizens have no health insurance. Many more have grossly inadequate coverage.

Yet four out of five have a chronic ailment. With this high tendency to illness, our over-65 citizens need three times as much hospital care as younger people. And the aged are the primary users of nursing homes and chronic disease hospitals. In New York City alone there are nearly 11,000 nursing homes.

And the cost of hospitalization is rising rapidly. Even in 1961, the latest complete figures we have, the average cost of each day in the hospital was \$35.

The total cost of health care for persons over 65 is estimated at more than \$5 billion a year. Nearly half of this goes into hospital and nursing home care, including custodial and mental hospital care.

The facts are before us: the growing number of aging citizens, the financial problems many of them face, the high cost of and therefore the lack of insurance, the tendency of the aging to chronic ailments, and the increased cost of hospital care.

The basic question we face as a Nation is how best to help our aging people meet this problem. I suggest that a broad-scale health insurance program for all of our aging, financed through a payroll tax, is the best kind of help we can give.

The payroll tax—the same financial source that the social security program uses—can be applied to most of the working force of our Nation; has a wide base; is easily collected, and does not fluctuate as much as the income tax.

Further, we could not load a broad program of hospital care for the aged onto the progressive income tax or the corporate income tax. Higher rates in those areas would, in my opinion, have a serious impact on our incentive to increase profits and income through growth. Even at this moment, Congress has before it a proposal to make substantial cuts in both of these taxes. Meanwhile, in the absence of a properly financed system, there is increasing pressure for a broadening of the Kerr-Mills Federal grant-in-aid plan, financed out of general revenues. Somehow, it is argued that this is voluntary. I know of nothing voluntary about the income taxes that must be paid to finance such a program.

Under the Lindsay-Tupper hospitalization insurance plan, as in King-Anderson, the payroll, or social security, tax rate would go up one-quarter of 1 percent.

Thus, an individual making \$4,800 a year would pay \$1 a month toward his old-age hospitalization insurance. This legislation, as in King-Anderson, would also increase the taxable wage base—this will provide higher benefits.

I will say here that I believe \$1 a month is not a high price for a working individual to pay for adequate insurance against hospitalization and nursing costs in old age.

I also believe the payroll tax is fair—it is shared 50-50 by employers and employees, and is paid by the self-employed during their working years. Thus, an employee paying \$1 a month would have \$1 more added by his employer.

Though the payroll tax aspects of my legislation are the same as King-Anderson, our bill differs in other aspects from the administration proposal in two very important ways:

First. Under the Lindsay-Tupper bill, individuals could choose either a Government or a private hospitalization insurance plan. The King-Anderson measure is compulsory Government health insurance with benefits offered only under a Government plan.

Second. States would administer the insurance plan under our legislation. In the administration proposal, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in Washington would handle the insurance program.

Like our earlier bill, this new version combines the payroll tax base with freedom of choice between a private and a government insurance plan. I want to stress that this feature distinguishes our measure most sharply from the administration bill.

This freedom of choice provision, or option, I believe will encourage the further growth and development of private health insurance and voluntary prepayment plans, particularly in the fields of catastrophic illness.

The Lindsay-Tupper bill provides this free option to covered persons under which they can have the benefits that would normally accrue to them over age 65, measured actuarially, paid over in cash either directly or by assignment.